

3



**TRANSFORMING SERVICE LEARNING
FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION:
MOVING FROM AFFECTIVE-MORAL TO
SOCIAL-POLITICAL**

*Transformando el aprendizaje servicio en la Educación
para la Ciudadanía Global: el paso de lo afectivo-moral
a lo socio-político*

Yulia Nesterova and Liz Jackson *

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to elaborate an alternative, empowering model of service learning for GCE that helps students relate to one another in more just ways. Our model emphasizes the student/global citizen as an autonomous, political subject, shifting concern from the ‘affective-moral’ to the ‘social-political’, drawing on ideas of justice propagated by John Rawls. Three principles we use to reframe GCE are (1) minimization of self-interest from moral choices, (2) respect for diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests, and right to decide, and (3) recognition of others as autonomous. Such a model can frame South-North and South-South transfer as alternatives to North-South models, and can be useful for enhancing service learning dimensions of national-level citizenship. The paper begins with an analysis of service learning for GCE and some of the opportunities and challenges found

* The University of Hong Kong (Hong Kong).

in commonly used North-South transfer models. After that, it discusses Rawls's ideas of justice and fair terms of cooperation for cross-cultural communication, and maps three principles for an alternative model for GCE. Each principle has educational implications, though each also poses new pedagogical challenges. The paper concludes with reflections on the kind of global citizen constructed and the implications of our model for students, their view of the world, and actions for social justice.

KEY WORDS: Global Citizenship Education, Service Learning, Intercultural Competence, John Rawls, Student Exchange

RESUMEN

Este artículo trata de elaborar un modelo alternativo y habilitador de aprendizaje-servicio para la educación para la ciudadanía global (EpCG) que ayude a los estudiantes a relacionarse entre sí de manera más justa. Nuestro modelo enfatiza al estudiante-ciudadano global como un sujeto político autónomo, cambiando la preocupación por lo “afectivo-moral” hacia lo “socio-político”, aprovechando las ideas de justicia propagadas por John Rawls. Tres principios que utilizamos para reformar la EpCG son: 1) minimizar el interés propio en las decisiones morales; 2) respetar la diversidad de opiniones, el legítimo conflicto de intereses y el derecho a decidir; y 3) el reconocimiento de los demás como sujetos autónomos. Este modelo puede estructurar los intercambios Sur-Norte y Sur-Sur como alternativas a los modelos Norte-Sur y también puede ser útil para mejorar las dimensiones de aprendizaje-servicio de la ciudadanía a nivel nacional. El trabajo comienza con un análisis del aprendizaje de servicio para la EpCG y algunas de las oportunidades y desafíos encontrados en modelos de transferencia Norte-Sur que se usan comúnmente. Después de eso, se discuten las ideas de Rawls sobre la justicia y los términos justos de la cooperación para la comunicación intercultural, y se trazan tres principios para un modelo alternativo para la EpCG. Cada principio tiene implicaciones educativas, aunque cada uno también plantea nuevos desafíos pedagógicos. El trabajo concluye con reflexiones sobre el tipo de ciudadano global que resulta y las implicaciones de nuestro modelo para los estudiantes, su visión del mundo y acciones para la justicia social.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Educación para la Ciudadanía Global, Aprendizaje Servicio, Competencia Intercultural, John Rawls, Intercambio de Estudiantes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalization has created worldwide relations in which we are closely linked to distant communities and people (KRUGMAN AND FOOTE, 2011). Out of this

interconnectedness three images have emerged. Global consciousness requires us to recognize injustices that occur across the world. Global ethics prescribes the need to develop values that help us relate to others and build relationships in an ethical and respectful way on a worldwide stage. Global citizenship means that we want to and can act upon the knowledge and values to improve the world and the circumstances of others. Some scholars, such as Torres (e.g., 1998) and Nussbaum (2008), articulate global citizenship as a type of amendment to or extension of traditional models of nation-state citizenship and civic education, as the latter is a more practical way of understanding identity and the knowledge, values, and behaviors owed to others within a clearer type of social contract, which has been more directly entered into by consenting members in a liberal democratic society. In contrast, the concept of global citizenship, as well as global consciousness and global ethics that give foundation to the idea, are less dependent on the context of the nation-state, as nation-states may vary in their approaches to civic identity. Others go further, extending global citizenship as responsibility to connect to and protect the wider world – people, living organisms, and the environment beyond local communities (DOWER, 2003; KRUGMAN AND FOOTE, 2011; PASHBY, 2011; PIKE, 2008).

Service learning trips for students between Global North and Global South countries¹ have become a major strategy of GCE for preparing youth to live in harmony with diverse others, by learning about them and the challenges they face, while also lending a hand in their communities. While such programs may be mutually beneficial and educational for all involved in some cases, in others they have been critiqued for prioritizing the needs, interests, and perspectives of global northerners, as well as inappropriately focusing on morality. A focus on student affective and moral development rather than social justice issues can result in such experiences reinforcing global power imbalances and failing to effectively acknowledge and deconstruct inequalities in North-South relationships.

This paper elaborates an alternative model of goals for GCE to help students of diverse cultures find common ground and relate to one another in a just way in service learning. It reframes the ideal global citizen as an autonomous, political subject, shifting the focus from the affective-moral to the social-political. We draw on ideas of justice propagated by John Rawls in *A Theory of Justice* and *Fairness as Justice: A Restatement* to elaborate this alternative approach. The three principles we consider are: (1) minimization of self-interest from moral choices; (2) respect for diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests and personal right to decide; and (3) recognition of persons as autonomous individuals.

¹ Global North is used here to refer to the European countries that used to have colonies in Africa, Latin America and Asia. The Global South refers to the former colonies.

The next section of the paper analyzes common North-South service learning approaches and their challenges. After that, the paper discusses Rawls's ideas and elaborates the three principles that can help reframe GCE for North-South as well as South-North and South-South exchanges, also briefly considering the implications of the principles for national-level citizenship and civic education more generally. Each principle has implications but each also poses new challenges to teachers and students. The paper concludes with reflections on the kind of global citizen conceived and other implications of the model for students, their view of the world, and actions for social justice.

2. SERVICE LEARNING FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: TRADITIONAL NORTH-SOUTH APPROACHES

As an extension of or alternative to traditional nation-state citizenship education, global citizenship education provides students with knowledge about the world beyond national borders and the injustices that people face globally. Ideally it helps students develop a set of moral values to want to participate in changing unjust circumstances, and equips them with skills to act to better the world, through national or international-level participation. As a way of deepening students' knowledge and understanding of the world and their place in it, study trips that include service learning between Global North and Global South countries have become a favored method of GCE. Service learning is often preferred as it takes education outside the classroom, and combines community service with learning that benefits both the providers of service and recipients of it (BARTLEET et al., 2016). In addition to reciprocity, Purmensky (2009) emphasizes that service learning can develop leadership skills, while Butin (2009) notes that respect, reciprocity, relevance, and reflection can occur among various people involved. Such trips are thus positioned as ideal for GCE as they entail intercultural exchanges that aim to prepare students to live in harmony with diverse others by learning about other cultures; building skills to negotiate, have dialogue, and reach consensus with others; and volunteering in communities to understand their challenges (ANDREOTTI and DE SOUZA, 2012; DOWER, 2003).

Such North-South service learning for GCE is thus increasingly employed today as residing in another culture, participating in collaborative projects, and making personal connections are important and valuable activities for developing empathy and a positive view of cultural pluralism (BENNET, 1993; VEUGELERS, 2011). However, North-South service learning that focuses on student affective and/or moral development primarily can entail problematic assumptions and practices in some cases. In particular, it may emphasize student morality to the neglect of the analysis of social, political, economic, and historical relations. The analysis of such relations and their influence on contemporary affairs and social injustice, however, should be key on the agenda of rebalancing global power dynamics (JOHNSTON et al., 2016). Additionally, the focus on student affective-moral

development in educational contexts reflects an emphasis on and prioritization of the needs, interests, and perspectives of those in the Global North over those in the Global South.

To develop students' morally and affectively, differences are often emphasized in North-South service learning for global citizenship. Often a deficiency model and social imaginary of development is relied on, that depicts global southerners as lacking material things and knowledge (JACKSON, 2014A). This imaginary can be reinforced, for example, by teachers in the Global North who, following strategies of development agencies, use and invoke shocking images and stories focused on poverty, helplessness, hunger, and chaos in the Global South when reflecting on service learning experiences and possibilities (PIKE, 2008). Such strategies may be used to intentionally or unwittingly facilitate a sense of guilt and shame in students and more generally invoke an emotional response to attract their attention to grave circumstances in Africa, etc. (OXFAM GB, 2006). Language used to teach students in the Global North about the *other* often contrasts developing with developed, and help and aid to the Global South with leadership and skills in the Global North, in a binary view of GCE.

As pointed out by Andreotti, Barker, and Newell-Jones (n/d), images and language construct a particular reality and mindset that divides and sets contexts in opposition to one another. The implications of using dramatic stories and pictures as well as specific words can be grave. Images and words are 'hugely influential in shaping our ideas about ourselves, other people and the wider world' (OXFAM GB, 2015, p. 13). They can create a divided world, of those who are marginalized and should be taken care of (southerners), and those who are to provide care (northerners). Jackson (2014b, p. 1070) notes that such a binary view may be intended as emotions such as compassion, sympathy, and pity are typically believed to be able to 'cause people to act righteously to aid others who are disadvantaged through no fault of their own.' Jackson (2014b, p. 1072) argues, however, that the belief that 'once an empathy gap is bridged, problems of structural nature can easily be solved' can be naïve. Even though such compassionate models of citizenship can ignite emotional concern and care, empathizing with others is not automatically appropriate or effective to bettering their lives. Such an approach can in contrast result in a prejudiced image of a disempowered other, who students from the Global North are unable to approach in a culturally appropriate way to establish a respectful communication platform.

Such service learning also tends to focus on the benefits to Global North students, wrongly assuming benefits to the Global South participants are assured in line with the deficiency view of development and aid. The self-improvement and self-interest aspects of GCE are prioritized in campaigns that encourage people in the Global North to engage in service learning in the Global South and/or to raise funds and/or awareness of problems faced. Relatedly, gaining more individual privilege and respect are two of the strongest motivators for youth to commit to acts of improving the lives of others, reflecting that

benefits to self are not just expected but sought out by participants in service learning for GCE (JACKSON and ADARLO, 2014). In contrast to the compassionate Good Samaritan model of service, Andreotti (2006) describes a training session for service learning for students traveling to an African country. In the session the students are asked to imagine a black-tie event at a ballroom where Nelson Mandela rewards one of them for helping people in Africa. The students are encouraged to envision what they wear, how they feel about what they have accomplished, and how they feel knowing everyone is waiting for them to speak. Self-interest rather than an orientation toward the other is illuminated here.

As Andreotti notes, the students involved did not find the visualizations problematic. Contrary to Andreotti's sense of unease, the students felt motivated by the possibility of improving their skills, such as leadership, and by feeling personal responsibility for 'changing or saving the world out there' (2006, p. 40). In such contexts students may be encouraged to believe naively that they are equipped with the right skills and knowledge backed by the right set of values and moral codes to be competent and effective in the Global South, due to deficiency, binary views of North and South. The idea promoted in such sessions is that you can take any person from the Global North, send them anywhere in Africa (or elsewhere in the Global South), and they will *a priori* have capabilities to take on the responsibility to fight poverty *for* the other, alleviate hunger *for* the other, and educate the undereducated other.

This tendency to assume cross-cultural deficiency, according to Jackson (2014a), precludes often sought-after Freirean praxis in service learning. Instead of enabling individuals and communities, youth volunteers further entrench inequalities and a sense of cultural superiority. Meanwhile, volunteer work carried out may not yield many positive results for the community supposedly being served. Describing experiences of youth volunteers in southern Africa, Jackson (2014a, p. 355) observes how projects were often inefficient due to volunteers' interpretations of the problems a community faces, that were based on assumptions of deficiency. Due to such an approach, that involves 'not just *not hearing* but also *not asking* effectively' what a community needs or wants, so-called gifts can symbolize inequitable power relations, rather than the cross-cultural good will intended.

These sorts of North-South service learning approaches and practices convey a message to students. Northerners are framed as generous givers and southerners as helpless receivers. According to this line of thinking, since privilege and wealth give northerners more opportunities to acquire skills and quality education, it is their moral duty to build communication platforms with southerners and provide them intellectual and material resources by volunteering in their countries. By implication southerners are portrayed as dependent, disempowered, and helpless, who live in poverty and want resources from the Global North. Southerners thus are available to those from the Global North to visit and

learn from, teach and help, and represent back home, because northerners can pay their way to the lives of global southerners. This message puts northerners in a position of power, as the driver in cooperation, while the other is disempowered (GALLWEY and WILGUS, 2013).

This approach to service learning for GCE lacks depth and reflexivity. Lack of depth means that there is no focus on unequal global power relations that have and do occur due to the history of colonialism and post-colonial realities. By ignoring history and placing it 'securely in the past' teachers suggest that it is over and there are no negative consequences to address (ANDREOTTI, 2006). This narrative suggests that historical dynamics do not affect 'the construction of the present situation' of a continued exploitation of the Global South through aid and trade in which the South often does not have a voice strong enough to oppose unequal relations and reclaim control over resources (ANDREOTTI, 2006; ANDREOTTI and DE SOUZA, 2012). Lack of engagement with historical dynamics and their implications precludes students from developing an ability to reflect on their positioning in relation to the other. The narrative that is transmitted focuses on the simplistic us/them binary where "us" is contra-distinct and defined in opposition to "them": we are wealthy, they are poor (TODD, 2009, p. 218). The discourse places northern students in the realm where they believe that the other is poor and disempowered because s/he lacks resources, services, markets, and education (ANDREOTTI, 2006, p. 45). Ignorance of the state of affairs casts blame upon the poor and justifies the mission to develop the distant help recipient (ANDREOTTI, 2006). As a result, there is little change in the perceptions of northerners about the other, little learning outside the box takes place, and engagement with diverse communities stays passive (MCCARTHY, 1996).

As pointed out by Veugelers (2011, p. 473), this pattern of GCE occurs due to teachers' choice to opt for a moral conception of citizenship education that is not as sensitive and challenging to implement in the classroom as compared with a historically based social-political version of citizenship. As defined by Veugelers (2011, p. 473), moral GCE is based primarily on 'sharing, taking responsibility for each other and preventing exclusion,' without systematically engaging historical dynamics or political analysis in discussions and interactions. Social-political citizenship, on the other hand, aims to develop critical student attitudes towards unequal power relations, change this imbalance, and instill understanding of socioeconomic differences. The social-political has greater potential to address the past and its implications in the present, which tends to be overlooked in the moral (and affective) approach. Teachers may believe that moral GCE is an important stage for students and, after having internalized moral values, students will be more able to analyze and act on political relations (VEUGELERS, 2011). Yet practical examples given here problematize the assumption of a linear process from affective-moral to social-political in concrete circumstances.

Global consciousness developed in the classroom should not simply be based on knowledge of injustices that happen across the world today. Students should be able to connect them to past and present unjust social, political, economic, and cultural dynamics. Global ethics should not focus on relating to the other in a moral and affective way, but on learning to see the other as an equal human being, with their own agency and value. Consequently, global citizenship should mean that students learn how to respectfully and ethically establish a space where people of different cultural backgrounds meet together to make changes that are beneficial and sustainable for all parties on their own terms. Rawls's theory of justice provides principles to frame an alternative type of service learning for GCE.

3. RAWLS'S PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE: AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

A social-political platform where students of diverse cultural backgrounds can meet and learn to cooperate with each other in just relations can draw on the ideal of justice as fairness developed by Rawls. With this ideal Rawls offers a practical formula to establish fair terms of cooperation between people who accept each other as autonomous and equal individuals with capacities to choose their own ends and live according to their own conceptions of the good. Rawls's formula includes developing a social contract of cooperation where every person and their knowledge and contribution can be treated equally and respectfully. The contract acknowledges the needs and interests of everyone, as it is entered into from the 'original position', wherein decisions are made using the 'veil of ignorance' among participants imagining themselves in the worst or least advantaged position in the context of the contract designed (RAWLS, 1999). Using the original position can help ensure participants' impartial contributions to envisioning fair cooperation among diverse community members. Rawls elaborates that the social contract must be entered voluntarily, with every participant recognizing all others as free beings who will act upon the reasonable rules imposed on the group. The contract aims to protect all participants' rights, liberties, and opportunities.

The strength of Rawls's theory for cross-cultural cooperation is that he acknowledges that we should agree to disagree as our conceptions of the good differ. This can enable effective cooperation particularly when people from two different cultures must learn and work together, whose moral beliefs, basic desires, everyday needs, and/or overall understandings of the world may differ fundamentally. The framework and principles established are relatively minimal. However, they provide a safe model for cooperation in a cross-cultural environment. The principles also provide a resolution to the challenge of North-South transferal GCE approaches wherein the affective-moral aspects of global citizenship and needs, interests, and perspectives of global northerners are prioritized. These principles can thus help build an alternative framing of service learning for GCE.

Figure 1. The 3 principles for an alternative model of GCE and how they address the critique.

Transforming the critique of GCE		
Typical Approach to GCE	Rawls' Principles	Alternative Approach to GCE
1. Enriching <i>our</i> understanding of the world on <i>our</i> terms	P1: Minimization of self-interest from moral choices	1. Acknowledging interests, needs, and perspectives of the other
2. Helping the poor in the global South by volunteering		2. Understanding southerners do not need saving by peers from the North; contemplating benefits interaction can (or cannot) bring
3. Developing tolerance towards difference		3. Appreciating difference as a source of learning and building just relationships; learning how power relations influence decisions and thoughts
4. Using material advantage to enter communities for own benefits (respect/recognition)		4. Understanding that advantage does not make the other available; where advantage comes from
1. Learning about the other	P2: Diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests, and right to decide	1. Building knowledge(s) with the other
2. Teaching our skills and knowledge to develop the other		2. Understanding that our skills and knowledge are partial and the Other also has skills, knowledge
3. Building relationships based on tolerance and harmony		3. Cooperating based on difference, not harmony and tolerance
4. Leading the structuring of contact, projects, goals, rules		4. Understanding that northerners should not exploit position to shape discourse and rules of cooperation
1. Positioning selves as moral participants of dialogue, treating others as disadvantaged recipients of skills and help	P3: Acceptance of autonomous individuals	1. Understanding northerners should not treat the Other in a moralizing way; realize the importance of respect, how development patterns influence societies, and how the Global North contributes to disadvantage
2. Students accept a pattern of development and relate to the other as disempowered victims		2. Students create space for cooperation under rules that are fair and regard all as autonomous, with different but equally valuable conceptions of the good

3.1. Principle one: Self-interest should be minimized from moral choices

This principle (P1) is based on the idea that ‘each participant’s rational advantage, or good’ should be considered when developing conditions for just cooperation (RAWLS, 2001, p. 6). That means that those with power should not be tempted to ‘exploit social and natural circumstances to their own advantage’ (RAWLS, 1999, p. 136). Speaking about North-South relationships, those with more power derived from colonial history and development patterns should be cognizant of their historical positioning in relation to people in the Global South who they try to build connections with. In the context of the classroom, this principle is more directed to teachers, who should understand that communication between students of different cultural backgrounds is not carried out for northerners to acquire knowledge *about* the other or develop tolerance towards difference or skills to live in a globalized world. It is instead about learning how to engage in respectful dialogue recognizing how we are differently positioned in global power relations that impact our decisions, thought processes, actions, and achievements.

In typical service learning under a North-South GCE model, the interests of northern students are prioritized. Parents of students from the Global North often believe it is their children's right to go to the Global South to learn *about* it and people living there because they provide financial resources (GALLWEY AND WILGUS, 2013). Under P1 teachers, parents, and students have to consider what advantages this interaction can bring to the disadvantaged. In the context of the classroom this will require an honest discussion of the following questions:

- What advantages do we have? Should our advantages give us more rights? How do others see our advantages?
- Are there benefits of interactions for people in the Global South country? If so, what are they, as seen by those in the Global South?

As discussed in the previous section, in North-South models of service learning students tend to go to the Global South with an ideal to help others while also helping themselves to achieve recognition and success. Under P1, northern volunteers would be encouraged to reconsider taking advantage of their interaction with the other to reach their own goals, while risking exploiting the so-called receiver of such help. More questions that should be asked are:

- Whose interests are represented in the structuring of service learning experiences?
- Who is empowered? Who is disempowered? Who is being empowered?
- Who benefits? Who loses? What are the implications?

A challenge for implementing P1 educationally is that it is rarely easy to step back and reconsider one's own position in relation to others. It is difficult when one's positioning in global relations is rooted in historical and economic dynamics that are typically ignored by teachers, as these are sensitive and complex topics to engage with young people. Ensuring the curriculum aims more generally to facilitate students understanding historical and political complexity is therefore necessary to utilize P1 to enable more productive North-South and South-North (and South-South) exchanges. Addressing the question of why some groups are advantaged over others can be complicated. Failing to examine the history of North-South relations in their problematic details can bring students back to the belief that there are the educated, skilled, and capable, and those who are not. However, learning about and more directly facing the issues of historical oppression and colonial exploitation will help students learn about their own society and community and cultural, and develop their abilities to recognize and productively understand historical trauma that can prevent honest and genuine communication with others.

3.2. Principle two: Diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests, and right to decide

Rawls argues in *A Theory of Justice* (1999, p. 189) that different people have ‘separate interests which may conflict.’ Therefore, they should develop a set of rules and procedures to regulate their conduct that everyone can ‘reasonably accept’ because the set is regarded by all as fair, reciprocal, and appropriate (RAWLS, 2001, p. 6). The prerequisite to engaging in this process is for students from both Global North and Global South as equal persons which, according to Rawls (2011, pp. 21, 23) means:

- a) They understand that every person in the group has ‘the moral power to have a conception of the good,’ that is, they are able ‘to form, to revise, and rationally to pursue a conception of the good’; and
- b) They understand that everyone is ‘entitled to make claims on their institutions so as to advance their conception of the good’. Thus students should be able to impact schools and school structures if and when students believe they are not being treated fairly.

In the case of North-South service learning for GCE wherein northerners go to the Global South, students inevitably learn about their own privileges in relation to people they visit. Yet in aiming to feel good or better about themselves and better their own environments, they may take advantage of peers in the Global South. Under P2, northerners could still travel to engage with peers in another culture; however, that engagement would be reframed to be of a more equitable nature. Northerners would understand that intercultural cooperation is not to learn *about* the other; it is about sharing and learning to construct meanings and knowledge together, with every person having space to contribute *no matter* how differing their opinions, values, and perspectives are. The questions that should be asked under P2 are:

- Do others want to interact with us, and how do they see such interaction?
- What do we want to learn about others and what do others want to learn about us?
Do they want to learn about us?
- How do we learn? How do they learn?
- How should we react and continue our cooperation if our views and perspectives are too different?

In typical North-South service learning it is often suggested that southerners do not possess required knowledge, skills, and values to develop economy, political system, health care, education and institutions. Under P2 students from the Global North can understand in contrast that their skills and knowledge may not be needed because others have a clear understanding of what they want and see as best for their communities, and what needs to

be done to make changes that will *work* in that context. Teachers and students in the Global North can also be helped to understand that *their* knowledge is partial, and that through honest interaction they can learn *from* and *with* the other rather than merely 'educate' from their views.

As Jackson observes, not all dialogue that is formally intended to serve disadvantaged members of a group can be mutually beneficial, particularly as benefits within *de facto* structures may be more readily and clearly perceived by more advantaged participants, who may, on the other hand, focus so much on learning from disadvantaged others that they remain in the position of differentially receiving benefits (2008). Additionally, northerners often initiate North-South interactions that ultimately come to fruition, and thus end up, seemingly incidentally, taking a leadership position in structuring these activities. In such circumstances exchange gives northerners power to shape the discourse and rules of cooperation that may disregard needs and interests of the other.

However, we should not give up on exchange, even if inequalities may be reinforced in such contexts. As noted in the previous section, personal connections can be important and valuable in developing empathy, understanding, and appreciation for pluralism. Meanwhile, educators and students should be made aware prior to engagements across communities that the views, perspectives, and interests of peoples in different cultures often reasonably diverge, and that they must therefore actively and critically strive in every intercultural interaction to build and rebuilt (and tear down, deconstruct and reconstruct as necessary) an environment where differences can be better understood, accepted, and respected in the future. In contrast, North-South oriented GCE approaches often fail if they are focused on such values as harmony, consensus, and universal moral code (ANDREOTTI, 2006; PASHBY, 2011; PIKE, 2008; TODD, 2009). In these contexts, educators can reinforce the idea that since diverse peoples have different interests and aspirations, universal harmony may be an overly idealistic, and inappropriately exclusive and divisive, goal to reach for. Instead, pluralistic difference can be recognized as a good based in valuing principles of respect for others.

Instead of learning about the other and teaching them what one thinks they need to know and do, parties should engage in an open and honest dialogue about what all know, what some parties do not know but perhaps should know, and how they should come to know it. Such a dialogue can be uncomfortable as it requires students and teachers to reflect systematically and critically on the knowledge they possess is and how they came to have it. It implies that all parties should reflect on what can be problematic about their perspectives and values and what should and could be un-learned. Here students and teachers should understand the promise and potential of trying to construct knowledge(s) and meanings with others, by integrating differing perspectives and values, despite how clashing they may seem to be.

3.3. Principle three: Recognition of others as autonomous individuals

Rawls (1999) believed a society must not socialize and acculturate a student to become a certain kind of individual. The third, and most important, principle therefore requires letting students develop and agree upon their own models and strategies of intercultural relationships in cooperation with peers from other cultures and countries. This principle gives some clear possibilities for revising conceptions of service learning for GCE.

Rawls's model of 'the veil of ignorance' can be used as a framework. The veil of ignorance can help students to analyze what is fundamentally unfair about their own societies and various types of possible cross-cultural and international interaction. It can encourage students to imagine what sort of cooperation would be just and fair in an overseas study trip. They could develop more just moral codes and rules for entering into agreement with the other from the original position. An original position could help them imagine being born in different socioeconomic and historical circumstances and help them approach a hypothetical agreement with people of a different culture and value system recognizing how they have lesser bargaining advantage (RAWLS, 2001, p. 16). What sort of interpersonal relationships would they like to have, had they been in the place of the other? What sort of environments would be safe for them to learn, express themselves, and practice freedoms, while not depriving others from enjoying the same privileges?

Educators can also apply P3 to consider the pedagogy they use more broadly for service learning and GCE, including activities that take place before and/or after possible exchange experiences. If we consider the cases of North-South service learning for GCE given earlier, the problematic language and images often used may seem trivial compared to other elements. However, they can have a strong influence on students because images and words help constitute people's mental realities. Under P3, would teachers in the Global North use shocking photographs of disaster or descriptions of southerners as needing help and expertise of northerners, because they have no abilities to achieve the same level of development, left on their own? The likely answer is no, as such images are not ethical from the perspective of the other, as they fail to show the other in a realistically representative and critical picture and context. Such images are seen from the original position as inhumane, as they depict southerners as victims who lack power and responsibility, their agency usurped and rights absent (DAHL, 2009). Teachers therefore can consider this pedagogy from the most disadvantaged perspective, imagining themselves in a position of a starving child. Would they really want someone's pity? Would they want to be seen as lacking inner force or capacity? Would they want to be treated with a paternalistic attitude? Would they want to be seen as disturbing, for being in such circumstances due to systemic inequalities? Would they want someone to act on their behalf without taking into consideration their wants, interests, and abilities? The answers to these questions may not be easy to consider or answer, but this complexity can help

teachers reflect on how using victimizing representations of differences and deficiency may not appropriate pedagogy for GCE.

To enable students to be autonomous they must be provided with responsibility and empowerment to act. Personal responsibility and empowerment were features of typical North-South GCE discussed in the previous section; however the direction of personal and group development is understood differently in relation to P3. Pike (2008) discovered that youth in Canada feel powerless to influence and effect changes in the areas that affect them. If students are autonomous, feeling responsibility for themselves to build something special and unique with others, they can shift from being responsive citizens who are told what to feel and think and how to engage, to being proactive citizens who have capabilities to construct alternative models of inclusive environments. Autonomous individuals feel that they have power to explore who they and others are, what defines them and others around them, what diverse others want and how interests and perspectives can be integrated, to name a few possibilities of autonomous inquiry. Additionally, autonomy can help students have a deeper conversation with others about what is going on in the world across communities and how events interact. Rawls (2001, p. 9) argues youth should develop an 'effective sense of justice, that is, one that enables them to understand and apply the publicly recognized principles of justice, and to act accordingly'. In this context this would mean that students develop comprehension of principles of justice and act upon shared ideals. Under P3 they do not act under rules *taught* to them. They create rules, values, and moral codes with *respected* others.

Through honest interactions with students of other backgrounds, the problematic aspects of common approaches to GCE – in particular, little reflection on past colonial history - can also be addressed. Under P3 open and honest conversations can help students learn about current problems and how they are connected to and influenced by colonialism and post-colonial developments. Understanding the implications will help students see the world in its complexity, something that GCE utilizing North-South service learning with typically short and surface immersion does not enable students to do effectively.

3.4. Broader implications for global and national-level citizenship education

While this paper has focused on the case of North-South service learning in GCE to illustrate how Rawls's principles can inform a reconstructed model, the analysis here has implications for other forms of service learning as well as for national-level civic education. In relation to the former, we envision that South-North and South-South forms of service learning for GCE can also be positively impacted by incorporating Rawls's principles. In relation to South-North service learning, Rawls's principles give strong justification, firstly, to consider how exchanges can be more equitable so that students and educators from the Global South may also visit the Global North. It may surprise students in the Global North

to note how and why students from the Global South could benefit from their travels (GALLWEY AND WILGUS, 2013, MACKENZIE, ENSLIN AND HEDGE, 2016); such possibilities invite critical questions that help students appreciate each other's positions and views across lines of difference. Considering how trips across locations would be structured according to the diverse preferences of different participants also can help students appreciate the more broad benefits pluralism can provide for them in developing their distinctive views of the good life. Likewise, South-South (and North-North) service learning for GCE can help students to appreciate the true complexity and diversity of the human experience, appreciating that north and south are not monoliths. Such alternative approaches to service learning for GCE should be considered and explored in more depth in future scholarship, as they provide distinctive opportunities to help students appreciate the world around them.

Finally, though this paper has focused primarily on GCE, as it is often seen as an extension of national-level citizenship we can also critically inquire into the implications of using Rawls's three principles in relation to local, national, and regional levels in civic education. As mentioned previously, service learning can take place within and outside national borders, so there is little reason to ignore the potential of this alternative model to augment service learning in the aid of national citizenship education. Students within a country or society (or even smaller community) are not all alike. Students should learn within civic education at any level to see the political reasons for inequality within society, justifying an approach that emphasizes the importance of minimizing self-interest from personal decision making, respecting diverse others in their community as people with their own views and self-interests, and recognizing others as fellow, ideally autonomous agents, who must develop their own sense of agency and empowerment at the local, national, and global levels. Work to broaden the use of these principles for understanding GCE and service learning within national contexts can help further develop civic education more generally.

4. CONCLUSION

Drawing on Rawls's theorization of justice and fairness, three principles can help teachers to educate for global citizens using service learning: minimization of self-interest from moral choices; respect for diversity of views, legitimate conflict of interests and right to decide; and recognition of autonomous individuals. Based on the principles, citizenship can be understood as a social-political concept, not only as affective-moral. If GCE from a moral perspective entails developing empathy and sympathy, the social-political citizen is more reflexive, proactive, and autonomous. He or she is not someone who *tolerates* the other and their differing worldviews because it is a moral thing to do. He or she sees that others have 'claims to liberty and equality,' and 'struggles to establish and secure [his/her] views and meanings,' just as he or she does (TODD, 2009, P. 218).

In this context, systems of social cooperation and worldviews must be acknowledged as diverse but worth initial equal recognition (TAYLOR, 1994). This does not mean that we uncritically accept and agree with knowledge, perspectives, and worldviews of others (TODD, 2009, p. 226). However, 'it does require a sustained openness to listen to other perspectives and to counter and respond. It requires treating each other as legitimate adversaries who are engaged in debate and struggle over meaning within a set of contesting norms and competing perspectives' (VAN POECK AND VANDENABEELE, 2012, p. 543). It requires a global citizen who minimizes self-interest from social interactions, accepts legitimacy of the other, acts respectfully when engaged in intercultural dialogue and projects, and is able to reflect on his/her actions and their implications. This approach can lead us to positively recognize the potential benefits of pluralism for greater peace and social justice, to enable opportunities to create an alternative system of justice that is truly *for all*.

Such an approach may bewilder and disorient students. Instead of providing them with a fixed set of knowledge and values, they are asked to act autonomously. Additionally, because it shifts the focus from the teacher to the student, employing alternative approaches to learning to engage and relate to others should be employed. However, making GCE for service learning more flexible, inclusive, and dynamic can make students appreciate complexities and uncertainties, and, as a result, develop a more critical and well-informed desire to create an alternative system.

REFERENCES

- ANDREOTTI, V. (2006): Soft versus Critical Global Citizenship Education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review*, 3, pp. 40-51.
- ANDREOTTI, V., BARKER, L., & NEWELL-JONES K. (n/d): *Critical Literacy in Global Citizenship Education: Professional Development Resource Pack*. Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice. Retrieved March 18, 2012 from <http://www.osdemethodology.org.uk>
- ANDREOTTI, V., & DE SOUZA, L. M. (2012): Introduction: (Towards) Global Citizenship Education 'Otherwise'. In V. Andreotti & L. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 1-6). New York: Routledge.
- BARTLEET, B. L., BENNETT, D., POWER, A., & SUNDERLAND, N. (2016): Arts-Based Service Learning with Australian First Peoples: Concepts and Considerations. In B. L. Bartleet, D. Bennett, A. Power & N. Sunderland (Eds.), *Engaging First Peoples in Arts-Based Service Learning: Towards Respectful and Mutually Beneficial Educational Practices* (pp. 3-14). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- BUTIN, D. W. (2003): Of What Use is It? Multiple Conceptualizations of Service-learning in Education. *Teachers College Record*, 105(9), 1674-1692.

- DAHL, G. (2009): Sociology and Beyond: Agency, Victimization and the Ethics of Writing. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 37, pp. 391-407.
- DOWER, N. (2003): *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- MACKENZIE, A., ENSLIN, P. & HEDGE, N. (2016): Education for Global Citizenship in Scotland: Reciprocal Partnership or Politics of Benevolence? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 77, pp. 128-135.
- GALLWEY, S.K., & WILGUS, G. (2013): Equitable Partnerships for Mutual Learning or Perpetuator of North–South Power Imbalances? Ireland–South Africa School Links. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 44(4), pp. 522-544. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2013.798178
- JACKSON, L. (2008): Dialogic Pedagogy for Social Justice: A Critical Examination. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 27(2), pp. 137-148.
- JACKSON, L. (2014a): They don't not Want Babies: Globalizing Philosophy of Education and the Social Imaginary of International Development. In C. Mayo (Ed.). *Philosophy of Education 2013*. Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.
- JACKSON, L. (2014b): 'Won't Somebody Think of the Children?' Emotions, child poverty, and post-humanitarian possibilities for social justice education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 46(9), pp. 1069-1081. doi:10.1080/00131857.2014.931430
- JACKSON, L. & ADARLO, G. (2014): Bridging Cultures Through Unpaid Labor: U.S. Volunteer Teachers' Experiences in China's Yunnan Province. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 27(5), pp. 2330-2352. doi: 10.1007/s11266-014-9519-1.
- JOHNSTON, M., BENNETT, D., MASON, B., & THOMSON, C. (2016): Finding Common Ground: Combining Participatory Action Research and Critical Service-Learning to Guide and Manage Projects with Aboriginal Communities. In B. L. Bartleet, D. Bennett, A. Power, & N. Sunderland (Eds.), *Engaging First Peoples in Arts-Based Service Learning: Towards Respectful and Mutually Beneficial Educational Practices* (pp. 51-70). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- KROGMAN, N., & FOOTE, L. (2011): Global Citizenship and the Environment: Embracing Life in all its Forms. In L. Shultz & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education in Post-Secondary Institutions: Theories, Practices, Policies* (pp. 108-119). New York: Peter Lang.
- MCCARTHY, A. M. (1996): One-Time and Short-Term Service-Learning Experiences. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Service-Learning in Higher Education: Concepts and Practices* (pp. 113-134). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- OXFAM GB. (2006): *Global Citizenship Guide: Teaching Controversial Issues*. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides>
- OXFAM GB. (2015): *Global Citizenship in the Classroom: A Guide for Teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/global-citizenship/global-citizenship-guides>
- NUSSBAUM, M. C. (2008): Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In T. Brookes (Ed.), *The Global Justice Reader*. London: Blackwell.

- PASHBY, K. (2011): Questions for Global Citizenship Education in the Context of the 'New Imperialism': For Whom? By Whom? In V. Andreotti & L. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial Perspectives on Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 27-46). New York: Routledge.
- PIKE, G. (2008): Reconstructing the Legend: Educating for Global Citizenship. In A. Abdi & L. Schultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*. New York: New York University Press.
- PURMENSKEY, K. L. (2009): *Service-Learning for Diverse Communities: Critical Pedagogy and Mentoring English Language Learners*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- RAWLS, J. (1999): *A Theory of Justice* (rev.ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- RAWLS, J. (2001): *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- TODD, S. (2009): Living in a Dissonant World: Toward an Agonistic Cosmopolitics for Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 29(2), pp. 213-227. doi:10.1007/s11217-009-9171-1
- TORRES, C. A. (1998): *Democracy, Education and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World*. Landham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- VAN POECK, K., & VANDENABEELE, J. (2012): Learning From Sustainable Development: Education in the Light of Public Issues. *Environmental Education Research*, 18(2), pp. 541-552.
- VEUGELERS, W. (2011): The Moral and the Political in Global Citizenship: Appreciating Differences in Education. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), pp. 473-485. doi:10.1080/14767724.2011.605329

PROFESIOGRAFÍA

Yulia Nesterova

PhD candidate in Education at The University of Hong Kong. **Datos de contacto:**
E-mail: yulia.s.nesterova@gmail.com

Liz Jackson

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, Division of Policy, Administration and Social Sciences Education. **Datos de contacto:** Runme Shaw Building 421, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong E-mail: lizj@hku.hk

Fecha de recepción: 7 de agosto de 2016.

Fecha de aceptación: 22 de diciembre de 2016.